

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached replacement sheets of drawings include changes to Figure 1, Figure 2, and Figure 4A.

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 were pending when the Office Action was mailed. Applicants herein cancel claims 1-18 and present new claims 19-38. Accordingly, claims 19-38 are currently pending.

The Office Action objects to Figures 1 and 4 under 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) and objects to Figure 2 due to informalities. Applicants herein amend Figures 1, 2, and 4A and the description to address these concerns. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw these objections.

The Office Action objects to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a) for failing to show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Specifically, the Office Action asserts that they fail to show every feature of the invention specified in claims 3, 8, and 9. Although applicants do not concur in the propriety of this objection, applicants herein cancel claims 3, 8, and 9. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this objection.

The Office Action objects to the specification and claims 10 and 14 due to informalities. Applicants herein amend the specification to address these concerns. Furthermore, applicants herein cancel claims 10 and 14. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw these objections.

The claim rejections presented in the Office Action are reflected in the following table:

<u>Claims</u>	<u>Basis</u>	<u>References</u>
1-7	102(e)	Chen
8 and 9	103(a)	Chen and Carroll
10	103(a)	Chen and Zhu
11-18	102(e)	Daniell

Although applicants have cancelled the rejected claims, applicants would like to make the following observations relating to the newly added claims. The Office Action relies on Chen in rejecting claims 1-10 as being either anticipated by Chen or

obvious in view of Chen and another reference. Chen is directed to a method for conducting a design conference over the internet. (Chen, Abstract). A conference initiator first establishes a conference and invites others to attend. (Chen, 4:53-60, 5:8-15). In some cases, an invitee may be required to provide a username and password before joining the conference. (Chen, 5:13-16). Once the conference is started, the conference initiator may select an image to display to the rest attendees. (Chen, 5:40-42). The attendees may then mark up the image to provide feedback or suggestions. For example, an initiator may select an image of a proposed layout for an integrated circuit and allow the attendees to suggest changes. A chat window is also provided to allow the conference participants to communicate further. (Chen, 5:43-44).

Daniell is directed to an instant messenger (IM) application capable of communicating over multiple IM networks. (Daniell, 2:33-54). The IM application is associated with a number of transport protocol objects (TPOs), each of which provides an interface to a specific IM network. For example, one TPO may communicate with the MSN IM network while another communicates with the AOL IM system. Daniell provides interoperability between multiple IM networks so that a user does not have to use multiple IM clients to access each of their IM accounts.

In contrast, applicants' technology shares system network objects (e.g., application programming interfaces, programming object libraries) in a distributed environment. (Specification, p. 3, ll. 4-7). Applicants' technology employs a uniquely identifiable context to monitor the "relationships between multiple system network objects (SNOs) and relationships between computers that may have copies of the objects or access to the objects." (Specification, p. 21, ll. 16-19). The context also includes security parameters for determining whether a computer may join a context and the access rights of a computer to the system network objects associated with the context. (Specification, p. 21, ll. 22-34). For example, one computer that has permission to join a context may have write access to at least one object associated with the context while another computer is denied access to the context entirely. Furthermore, because the context stores information about computers storing copies of an object, the context can facilitate the synchronization of the objects by notifying

each computer of modifications made to any copy of the object. (Specification, p. 4, II. 11-17).

Claim 19 recites:

after the first computer has joined the shared context,
receiving from the first computer a request to
modify a first system network object
associated with the shared context;
in response to receiving from the first computer a
request to modify a first system network
object associated with the shared context,
determining whether the first computer has
permission to modify the first system
network object.

Similarly, claim 24 recites:

after the first computer has joined the shared context,
receiving from the first computer a request to
modify a first system network object
associated with the shared context;
determining whether the first computer has
permission to modify the first system
network object.

Similarly, claim 31 recites:

a component that, after the first computer has joined the
shared context,
receives from the first computer a request to
access a first system network object
associated with the shared context;
determines whether the first computer has
permission to access the first system
network object.

Neither Chen nor Daniell discloses these features. In Chen, users provide their username and passwords to connect to a design conference. Once connected, however, the system does not require that the users be authorized to access any objects provided by the system. Similarly, in Daniell, a user may enter a username and password to connect to a particular IM network. However, once connected to each network, the network does not determine whether a user has permission to

access objects associated with the network. Neither Chen nor Daniell disclose the multiple layers of permission for sharing system network objects disclosed by applicants. Accordingly, claims 19, 24, and 31 are patentable over the cited prior art, as are their dependent claims 20-23, 25-30, and 32-38.

Furthermore, the claims recite synchronizing of copies of a network object.

Claims 19 and 24 recite:

synchronizing the first system network object by notifying each computer that stores a copy of the first system network object of the modification so that each computer can modify its copy of the first system network object.

Similarly, claim 31 recites:

a component that synchronizes the copies of the first system network object by sending notification to each computer that stores a copy of the first network object.

Neither Chen nor Daniell discloses this feature. Applicants' technology allows computers to share copies of objects in a distributed environment and provides a means for synchronizing objects when one copy is modified. Neither Chen nor Daniell disclose a technique for synchronizing system network objects. Accordingly, claims 19, 24, and 31 are patentable over Chen and Daniell, as are their dependent claims 20-23, 25-30, and 32-38.

Based on the above amendments and remarks, applicants respectfully request early allowance of this application. If the Examiner has any questions or believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned at (206) 359-8548.

Applicants believe the required fee is being paid in connection with this response. If any additional fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 50-0665, under Order No. 418268847US from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: 1/31/08

Respectfully submitted,

By Maurice J. Pirio
Maurice J. Pirio

Registration No.: 33,273
PERKINS COIE LLP
P.O. Box 1247
Seattle, Washington 98111-1247
(206) 359-8000
(206) 359-7198 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant